

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet 4/4 of drawings includes changes to Fig. 8. This sheet, which includes Fig. 8, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8. In Fig. 8, in 82 and 83, “FORTH GLOBAL” has been changed to - - FOURTH GLOBAL - - as required by the examiner.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In paragraph 2 of the office action, the drawings are objected to requiring that Fig. 8 be corrected to change “forth global” to - -fourth global- -. The drawings have been amended and a replacement sheet filed herewith making the required changes. Allowance of the drawings as amended is requested.

In paragraph 3, the abstract is objected to requiring that line 2 be amended changing “in” to - -an- -. The required change in the abstract has been made. Allowance of the specification as amended is requested.

In paragraph 4, claims 1 and 6 are objected to requiring that “in” be replaced with - -an- - before “input”. The required changes in claims 1 and 6 have been made. Allowance of the required changes in claims 1 and 6 is requested.

In paragraphs 6, 4, and 9 are rejected as being indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 6 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis for “said management circuit”. It is submitted that claim 6 is now allowable under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, which allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 9 have been amended to make clear that a management circuit places a control bit in a first condition when an incoming LCW cannot be combined with a previously stored LCW and places the control bit in a second state when the incoming LCW can be combined with a previously stored LCW. This is supported in paragraph [0032] of the specification. It is submitted that claims 4 and 9, as amended, are allowable under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 8 of the office action, claims 1-3, 5, 6-8, and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,455,831 to Bartow et al. (hereinafter Bartow). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Bartow is directed to frame group transmission and reception for parallel/serial buses by asynchronously transmitting data blocks, in parallel, across multiple fibers in a serial manner. The examiner has said that or gate 598, FIG. 5, is a combiner for combining the incoming LCW with a previously stored LCW. Circuit 598 drives the Write FIFO line. It drives all of the various reasons that cause a FIFO entry. It does not take multiple reasons to combine them into a single FIFO entry. Nor does it take multiple LCs and combine them into a single LC as

claimed. Some of the reasons circuit 598 process are the receipt of all LCs within the skew window, having one or more LCs not received within the skew window, or having different LCs with different values received within the skew window indicating the frames from different frame groups have been detected. See Col. 8, lines 30-33, if all LC's have been received and they all compare equal, the output of and gate 582 is active. This output feeds OR gate 598, which, in turn, causes a write into the FIFO 568. See also col. 8, lines 38-46, if an LC is damaged by transmission noise on the link, it is not detected by the receiver. At this point, the output of the compare circuit 588 becomes active and it feeds OR circuit 598 which causes an entry to be made into the FIFO 568. In this situation, the summary information in the FIFO 568 indicates which of the receivers did not receive an LC. See col. 8, lines 47-48, another possible result of a damaged LC is the apparent overlap of two different frame groups. At col. 8, lines 60-62, an inverter (N) 566 detects the non-compare and feeds OR gate 598 which, in turn, causes a entry into the FIFO 568. It is submitted that Bartow does not show, teach, or suggest combining an incoming LCW with a previously stored LCW, as claimed.

Claims 1, 6 and have been amended to claim determining that the incoming LCW can be combined with the previously stored LCW such that more than one LCW is combined and the combined LCW is stored in an element of the queue. It is submitted that Bartow does not combine more than one LC in a FIFO as claimed. It is submitted the Claims 1 and 6, and claims depended therefrom, are allowable under USC 102(b) over Bartow, which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 9, claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartow in view of US Patent 5,610,945 to Gregg et al. (hereinafter Gregg). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Gregg is directed to a system and method for asynchronously receiving data blocks, in parallel, across multiple fibers in a serial manner. It is submitted that neither Bartow nor Gregg, either alone or in combination, show, teach or suggest combining an incoming LCW with a previously stored LCW such that more than one LCW are combined and the combined LCW is stored in an element of a queue, as claimed. It is submitted that the claims are allowable under 35 USC 103(b) over Bartow in view of Gregg, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/Floyd A. Gonzalez/

BY: FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney

Registration No. 26,732

Phone: 845-433-7282

Fax: 845-432-9601